

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

AUGUST, 1833.

ART. I. *The Parts of the Revelation that exhibit the Church in our own Time, considered.*

(Continued from page 14.)

I HAVE already considered the character of the woman—her enemy, the dragon—the nature of the opposition which he makes to her, which we have seen to be of two sorts, “deceit and violence”—the means appointed for the woman’s preservation, which are three, “wings of a great eagle, that she may fly;” “her place prepared of God,” and “the earth helps the woman.” The consideration of her flight concluded the last paper. It remains now to consider the second means of her safety, “*her place.*”

I have already hinted that her particular external location in this world, is not to be excluded from the meaning of her place. Whether the woman be considered individually, or in a collective sense, she must be a resident in some place of the earth; and that place, wheresoever it be, must be ordered and prepared in the providence of him who watches over her safety, and makes all things work together for her good. In this particular of her interest, infinite wisdom and love go before her, as the pillar of cloud did in the wilderness before Israel, and seek out, and point to the place where she is to pitch her tent, and determine how long she is to continue there. But as there is no visible society yet set up that is proof against the errors of this flood, so neither has there been any *place* found which can exclude them. It is only the Word and Providence of God, taken together, that can at any given time within the 1260 days, lead to the place where she may reside in safety, and these, like the meridian and the latitude on the map, will always lead to the very place.

The reader will observe, that her place is, through the whole period, to be in “*the wilderness.*” The wilderness, in a symbolical sense, is here contrasted with the “*earth,*” where the dragon has his seat, and on which he pours forth his flood, and which opens its mouth and swallows it. The earth is a symbol for all manner of earthly-mindedness and earthly life. When it is used to hold up to view earthly men, it may denote riches and splendor, luxury, lust, and power; or, in other words, “the lust of the eye, the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life;” 1 John ii. 16. When it symbolizes them as professors of religion, it means, in

mass, all that is human in their religion—their doctrines, and commandments of men; their pomp and ceremony; their decorated churches, splendid robes, and enchanting music; their moving oratory, and words of men's wisdom. Now, the *place of the woman*, in order to its being a safe retreat for *her*, must be in respect to all these things a "*wilderness*," a place where they do not grow, and are not to be found. If she will be safe, she must retire from all such things, and from the company that delight in them. She can at no moment venture out of her wilderness and approach the abodes of earthly life safely. The dragon, who never sleeps or tires in his vigilant search after her, waits for such a rash and daring venture in her, as his golden opportunity. Whensoever he sees a congregation or a whole ecclesiastic body lusting after his earth, and imitating the fashion of his great party, he sets his snare in their path, and when *we* see them doing so, we may safely conclude that ere long they will fall into it. What holds true with regard to the whole body of God's people, holds true with regard to individuals. If the individual Christian would pass safely to the "house of many mansions," he must pass in a manner *unknown* through the world, a stranger to its fashions, its language, and its joys. And if at any time Satan lays before his imagination a map of worldly glory and pleasure, with many fair promises, upon the old condition of worshipping him, the believer's only safety is, in taking to his great eagle-wings of faith, and fleeing into his wilderness, and his place assigned him in the providence of God. "And having food and raiment, let him therewith be content," "for he hath said, I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." If this be the only way of safety, as most certainly it is, then the present course pursued by many, very many professing christians, and not fewer, in proportion, of the Associate Church than of other Churches, must be one of extreme danger to the present and succeeding generations. Most certainly the prevailing taste in respect of education, dress, manner of life, pursuits, &c., cannot agree with the rule already quoted. The end which men set before themselves, to which all their operations and toil are to tend, is *not food and raiment; things honest in the sight of all men, or that they may have to give to him that needeth*; but it is "to add house to house, and field to field." With as much avidity and energy of soul do they "lade themselves with thick clay," and grasp "*the earth*," as though their *heaven* and their *eternity* were here beneath the sun, while the affairs of their scriptural profession are like the "garden of the sluggard," and the "house that droppeth through;" and those children, who are soon to occupy their place, are taught to approve of "this wisdom and way," and they of themselves will naturally, in their turn, *improve* upon it.

The woman's place is "*prepared of God*." Although it is in a wilderness, yet it is a place of great security. It has infinite strength. The gates of hell cannot prevail against it. Here it is, "A man shall be an *hiding-place* from the wind (*of diverse and strange doctrine*), and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place; as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land;" Isa. xxxii. 2. This man, the man Christ Jesus, is the place to which the woman, by the wings of faith, flies; and him she "follows whithersoever he goes," and she is safe. So long as a church flies to Christ as he *is*, and not as *imagined* and *described* by ignorant men, or crafty and desinging aspirants, she is as safe from the flood of errors and delusions as if she were within the very *throne* of God. That Christ is the only place which is calculated to preserve from the flood of wicked and anti-scriptural tenets, is so easy to be seen, that it scarcely needs any remark. For if dwelling immediately in the light of the sun is a perfect security against being in darkness, so must embracing and holding the truth be against error. Christ is "*the truth*,"

The whole truth, and nothing but the truth; and therefore it must be, that whosoever abides in Christ is safe from error.

Although the woman's place is in the wilderness, yet it has no want of any thing that is needful to nourish and feed her. So much is expressly said concerning it; and it may be fairly inferred from the passage just quoted; for it is as "rivers of water in a dry place." What can be more needful or more refreshing in a dry place than waters? and what more abundance of it can be desired than "rivers!" In Christ, her hiding place, there is "fulness of grace and truth"—"all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge"—"all the promises, yea, and amen"—"all power in heaven and earth," to give her meat in due season—"and in him she is complete." In him is laid up the whole of God's covenant for her safety here, and glory afterwards; Isa. xlii. 6. And it is "ordered in all things, and sure." It has provided her with a revelation of God's mind and will in the Old and New Testaments, so necessary in every thing which it contains, that "nothing is to be taken from it," and so complete, that "nothing is to be added." It "is all profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be *perfect, thoroughly furnished*, unto all good works;" 2 Tim. iii. 16. It has provided her with all ordinances that are needful and proper to her in her wilderness situation:—the ordinance of the holy Sabbath, to commemorate the resurrection of her Lord, and therein, the ground and security of her acceptance before God: the ordinance of preaching, to set before her, in all its particulars, this covenant, and Christ crucified, her hiding place: the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper, to signify and seal the same to her receiving it by faith: a throne of grace, to which, at all times, and in every place, she may come boldly, and obtain mercy, and find grace to help in every time of need: a song, also, which she may sing in the house of her pilgrimage, and in the night of her affliction, which lifts up her soul out of all its down-castings and depths, unto God the eternal fountain of her joy: and it has also laid down the path in which all the steps of life and duty are to be taken; so that whatever she has to do, individually or socially, publicly or privately, *the way* of doing it is before her. Through these ordinances, her God hath appointed to nourish and feed her out of the inexhaustible fulness of her hiding place, Christ. While professors dwell in this place by faith, and draw the living water from these wells of salvation, it is impossible that all the violence of the satanic flood can reach them; and when they leave this place, and these ordinances, it is just as impossible that they can be safe. In other words, the safety of the Church, during the 1260 days, from error and corruption of every sort and degree, lies in adhering closely, by the vital principles of *faith and love*, to these ordinances of the new covenant. I say *faith and love*, because there are other principles on which a Church or an individual may externally adhere to the letter and form of them, and do it with great exactness and tenacity; but when it is done on *any* other principles at all, instead of being safe *from* the flood, they are safe *for* it; because, whatever other principle it may be, it is but one of the elementary principles of the flood itself.* If professors and Churches then mean not to be surprised by "sudden destruction, while they are dreaming of peace and safety," they must show a becoming solicitude to have and to keep pure and entire all the ordinances of God's covenant, and they must not be less so to have *faith and love* as the principles by which they adhere to them. These ordinances, and that faith and love, are two which God hath joined together, which no Church or professor may put asunder, but at the hazard of ruin and death. But what is the existing state of things? Will the truth just stated allow the inference that the visible

Church is, generally speaking, in this place prepared of God? Are they very solicitous to "receive, observe, and keep pure and entire all such religious ordinances and worship as God hath appointed in his word?" Are those who "hold fast the form of sound words," doing so "in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus?" 2 Tim. i. 13. Do they appear, generally, to be apprised of the exceedingly great danger that there is in leaving this place? The contrary of all this makes up the true state of their case. The great solicitude of very many seems to be, how to cast off regard to every form of sound words, without appearing shamefully inconsistent before men, and without awakening in their own minds a just sense of the demerit of their own conduct. While the ordinances of God are treated as if they were of no value, the ordinances of man are the objects of idolatrous wonder and admiration. They cannot be satisfied with "casting down to the ground the place where God's name dwells," nor with extolling the "doctrines and commandments of men." There is no Church in safety—not even they who are "displaying a banner because of the truth."

Very many members are settled down in a state of carnal security and stupid formality. They cannot be aroused by any ordinary means. The watchmen are asleep at their posts. There is treason in the city. Judas is betraying his Master with a kiss. Sincerity in vows and professions is gone. "Take ye heed every man of his neighbor, and trust ye not in any brother, for every brother will utterly supplant, and every neighbor will walk with slanders; and they will deceive every one his neighbor, and will not speak the truth; they have *taught their tongue to speak lies*, and weary themselves to commit iniquity. Thine habitation is in the midst of deceit; through deceit they refuse to know me, saith the Lord. Therefore thus saith the Lord, I will *melt* and *try* them: for how shall I do for the daughter of my people? Their tongue is an arrow shot out; it speaketh deceit: one speaketh peaceably to his neighbor with his mouth, but in heart he layeth his wait. Shall I not visit them for these things? saith the Lord: shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" Jer. ix. 4—9.

This place of the woman is prepared of God in a *providential manner*. The covenant, which I have mentioned above, is ordered, not only in respect to the fulness that is in Christ, and of the ordinances through which that fulness may come, but also in respect to the *times, places, manner, and means*, in and by which she may have access to ordinances. There shall be always a place prepared for her, and, verily, she shall be fed. But it may vary much in these particulars now mentioned. For a time Elijah was to be fed in the ordinary way, but after a time that way did not comport with his safety. God had a place prepared for him at the brook Cherith, which is before Jordan, and there the ravens were commanded to feed him with bread and flesh, morning and evening. But, by and bye, the brook dries up, and this was to be his place no longer. God prepared him a place at Zarephath, where he commanded a widow woman to feed him. This widow had put a handful of meal in a barrel, and a cruse of oil; and lo, when he came to the city, she is gathering two sticks, that she might prepare it for herself and son, that they might eat it and die. Nevertheless he was fed in that place until the day that the Lord sent rain upon the earth. Thus, from place to place, God prepared a place for him, and he, *believing the word* of God, fled thither, and was fed. But, reader, how would it have fared with the prophet, had he not had the *great wings of faith* to fly? Had he, like many, resolved to *walk* on the feet of reason, these places would have afforded him no safety or support, for he would never have reached them at all. He would have said, "how absurd to leave the public markets and stores,

and go to this brook in expectation that carnivorous birds, so fond of flesh themselves, will bring their flesh to me regularly. Why may not God as easily preserve me here? This is enthusiasm. I will not go." Neither would he have gone more swiftly, in the way of reason, to the widow of Zarephath. It is somewhat similar still. The woman is, for the most part, fed in the ordinary way, by the public ordinances of the Gospel, dispensed in a fixed way. God maintains a succession of ministers and elders for this end; and he maintains them individually in their office and in their day; and "they shall feed her there." When she hath access to the ordinances, as God hath appointed them in his word, they are the place where she shall be fed and be safe, if for these two ends she *fly* thither. But public ordinances are not *always* her place. By some or other of those ordinances enumerated above, she shall be fed and have a place, but by which of them, it is not revealed, except by the providence of God; much less is there any ground to conclude that she will invariably enjoy, or that she *must* enjoy public ordinances. It is true, public ordinances will not fail to be dispensed somewhere. Yet the "remnant of her seed" may often be without them, and in order to be safe from the "flood," at special times, they *must* be so. Whensever it happens that a congregation or a single individual professor is deprived of opportunity to attend public ordinances, as they are appointed in God's word, or at least, without any *known* error, their "*place*" of safety is to be *without* public ordinances. For it is impossible that they can hold fellowship in public ordinances with a *SINGLE* error, and be in safety; and much less can they do so when the error is known to them and has been denounced by them in their public testimony. For it is not conceivable that "a place prepared of God" can be a place where we must necessarily swallow at least *some drops* of this flood. Now that it often falls to the lot of the Lord's people to be so situated, requires no proof. Congregations are frequently vacant for years together. Christian families are, in the providence of God, sometimes far removed from their brethren in profession, and solitary individuals likewise are so. It may be, that the "woman," properly, is sometimes a solitary individual, who has not visible fellowship with another on earth, not even with him in whose bosom she lies. Very many, may I not say the greater part of professors, account this to be an hard case—a place to which they will not go. To have public ordinances in the neighborhood, and not to attend them, because of one or two points of error embodied in them, is to them an intolerable idea. Thus they say, "shall we sit here at home, Sabbath after Sabbath, and see our family rise up to maturity without the benefit of public ordinances! It *must* be our duty to attend ordinances. It cannot be right to stay at home on account of a few minor points of difference. Such a one preaches a good gospel sermon, &c. But, reader, all this talk is but the stumbling and falling of *reason* attempting to walk where faith must *fly*. The woman's place can, in no instance at all, be entered by reason; but that faith which mounts up by the word of Him who cannot lie, far beyond the utmost point of reason's vision, finds it at all times a place of easy access. In vain will the subtle fowler lay his snare of a *few minor points of error* in the sight of this bird. It perceives the danger. And that in comparison with it, the domestic circle, or even solitude itself, is a place of safety. In either of these situations, there is no want of nourishment for the soul. "Man lives, by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God," and in either of these places the Christian may have *all* the words of God—all his promises, and, among the rest, that very one, which measures out strength for a day, without public ordinances. He or she, as the case may be, has a great High Priest within the veil, interceding for him, and

a Throne of Grace where he may come boldly. The parent, in the midst of his rising offspring, can engage in all the exercises of family religion. He has a double opportunity and a double motive for answering to them the important question, "what mean ye by this service," *this remaining at home*, and not going with the rest of the neighborhood? These are the ordinances and duties which God himself has expressly appointed for nourishing the woman. The brook Cherith ran dry to the prophet, but these never, never will; they are *wells* that spring up from the *Infinite Fountain* itself, and that spring to eternal life. "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, (concerning them,) the barrel of meal shall not waste, and the cruse of oil shall not fail, until the day that the Lord send rain (of gospel doctrine) upon the earth." Let no widow woman or solitary christian any more say, "Behold, I am gathering two sticks, that I may go in and dress it for me and my son, that we may eat it and die." Whoever lives at the end of these days, may boldly challenge all the solitary ones who have, by faith, occupied this place at Zarephath to say, that either their handful of meal wasted, or their cruse of oil failed. But I know that many of them can say, even now, that their adhering to this solitary place has only been the means of safety and of nourishment to themselves, but of opening springs of "water in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert," to others. "When the poor and needy seek water, and there is none, and their tongue faileth for thirst, I, the Lord, *will hear them*; I, the God of Israel, will not forsake them. I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of the vallies. I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water. I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, the shittah tree, and the myrtle, and the oil tree. I will set in the desert the pine tree and the box tree together, that they may see, and know, and consider, and understand together, that the *hand of the Lord hath done this*, and the Holy One of Israel hath created it." Isa. xli. 17—20. Have not several of my readers seen "the little one become a thousand, and the small one a strong nation?" And if there are others yet "solitary in the woods," let them wait on the Lord, for he says, in the same verse, "I, the Lord, will hasten it in his time." Isa. lx. 22.

I come to consider now, the last means ordained for the woman's safety, that is, "the earth helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth and swallowed the flood," &c. I observe here, that the help given by the earth is not *intended* help. Some interpreters laying hold of the word "help," have inferred that it was an act of friendship to the woman; and this has led them to such a view of the prophecy, and of the events by which they supposed it to be fulfilled, that does not at all agree with the known character of the earth, nor with what is here stated concerning it. It has been interpreted to mean such friendly aid as was given to the Reformers by some of the great men in power, such as Luther received oftentimes from Frederick of Saxony. But to say nothing of the very doubtful identity of such a man as Frederick with the earth, it is altogether inconsistent with the elementary principles and the known history of the earth, (I mean the party symbolized by it,) to suppose that it can have one friendly feeling for the woman, or a single wish to prevent her destruction. In ch. viii. 13, John says, he "saw an angel flying through the midst of heaven, saying, with a loud voice, woe, woe, woe to the inhabitants of the earth." But if the inhabitants of the earth had a fellow-feeling with the woman, these woes would never have been uttered. But to proceed. The character of that party is most clearly implied in the 20th and 21st verses of chap. ix. For its worshiping of devils, and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and wood; and murders, and sorceries, and fornications, and thefts, were the

procuring causes of the first of these woes, and that, however terrible a scourge it (the Turks) was, "*yet they repented not.*" And this impenitence is a permanent feature in their character, for we find them retaining it after the two succeeding woes were inflicted. We need not, therefore, be surprised to find, ch. x. ver. 2, that Christ sets his feet upon them as his enemies. In ch. xi. ver. 10, we are told, that the plain and faithful dealing of the witnesses was a torment to them, and that they will rejoice when these witnesses are dead. In this, ch. xii. ver. 12, we are informed, that the devil is to have his seat and influence among them. In ch. xiii. ver. 8, they are represented as the worshippers of the Beast, whose names are not written in the Lamb's book of life; and in the 11th verse, that they are the nest in which shall be hatched that brood of carnal hypocrites which shall come abroad into the greater part of the world, in the outer garb of *ministers* of the Lamb, but who, in fact, teach the doctrine of the dragon. It therefore seems to me impossible to imagine, that this help which they give to the woman is intended to be *help*. And this is confirmed by the manner which this help is given, that is, by "*opening their mouth and swallowing the flood which the dragon cast out of his mouth.*" They drink down the waters of error and delusive superstition as greedily as the thirsty ox does the water. It is congenial to their earthly, unrenewed nature, and agreeable to their taste and manner of life, the lusts in which they delight to indulge. **This helps the woman indirectly.** For it may well serve to alarm her at any opinion or tenet, and to hasten her flight from it, when she perceives it to be so palatable to such people, that they eagerly seek after it, and greedily drink it down as their native aliment. And when the teachers of errors are so busily engaged, and so remarkably successful in making proselytes of carnal, earthly men, that they have neither time nor temptation to urge their opinions upon the attention of sober, humble Christians; or when they are so dazzled with the earthly splendor of their adherents, and so inflated by flatteries, that they account the plain, unassuming, retiring Christian beneath their notice, or deserving their contempt, it helps the woman. By these means, the flood is stayed from coming after her. She is allowed to sit quiet, and is reminded of the difference between herself and the earth, and admonished to fly to her place, and to keep close to it. And in *what way soever* the earthly, carnal multitude *stay* anti-scriptural opinions from going beyond the circle of their own society, it is a help to the woman. In this manner she has been helped from the first, and she is still. May I not assume, as matter of fact, that there are many of the popular tenets of the present day totally unknown to many hundreds of private Christians in the Associate Church, owing to the disesteem in which her profession and her way is held; and that she herself is known as a Church, to a very small extent, owing to the same cause. No doubt this is meant for evil on the part of many who drink down the fashionable doctrines, but God means it for *help*, and it will be the wisdom of all her people so to reckon it instead of giving heed to the feelings of wounded pride.

Most of the practical instruction contained in the passages which I have been considering, have been anticipated. Still it may be observed,

1st. That true christian fellowship is not always visible and organized. The "woman" is a noun, signifying a multitude of persons, few of whom have lived in the same age or in the same country. Yet they had real fellowship together; they all lived in the same wilderness; all ate of the same spiritual meat, and drank of the same spiritual drink. Their love and hatred, their joy and sorrow were the same. Their faith and their practice were the same. They "were so perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment, that they are here represented as

but one person. Those who have "one faith, one Lord, one baptism," have as real and true fellowship together as the members of one family can have, although they may have lived in all the countries of the world, and in all the ages intervening the days of Abraham and the end of time. Yea, although some of them be on earth and some of them in heaven. For "they are come unto Mount Sion, unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels; to the General Assembly and Church of the first born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect;" Heb. xii. 22. On the contrary, all visible and organized fellowship is not true and real. When men have and avow different and inconsistent doctrines—when one holds to an indefinite atonement, another to a general one, and a third believes that Christ atoned for his elect alone—when one contends that Presbyterian government alone has the authority of Christ, and another regards every form of government as equally good—one holds to the Psalms of the Bible—another sees no harm in imitation—their assembling within the same walls and sitting at the same communion table on the same day, can never constitute true and real fellowship. And is there not a wide-spread misunderstanding on this subject? Is not the belief exceedingly common, that if a man do not attend public ordinances, or have them not within his reach, he has no christian fellowship, and is not in the church? and on the other hand, that going to church and sitting at the communion table, is another name for true fellowship? Believing this false dogma, men take the alarm at the temporary want of public ordinances and fly from their prepared place into some visible fellowship, against which they have witnessed, as being in some part erroneous, and so they are caught in the devil's snare. Their reasoning on this point is most fallacious. 'Tis as if a man should say, it is much safer for me to partake of this public entertainment, although I know very well that there is a little mortal poison mixed in the dishes, than to be obliged to eat, from day to day, in my own private family, where I am sure all the victuals are safe and nourishing. Or, I will drink only the pure waters of Shiloh, and turn aside those drops of the dragon's flood that have fallen into them, when they come to my lips. Is there not reason to fear here, that the heart of many is deceived as much as the head? That, instead of being drawn by their love to public ordinances to join some visible communion, they are DRIVEN into this measure by the irksomeness of a whole day of secret and private communion with God? If conscience durst speak out, would it not declare that this is the very thing which causes many to make shipwreck of their scriptural profession, and, with a wanton hand, to violate their most solemn covenant engagements?

2d. When the woman's place is a place without public ordinances, she has reason to expect that God will not let her be a loser by it. There "she shall be nourished." Although in itself considered, it is not a place to be preferred, being a straitness. Yet it is often a place of the most exquisite soul-refreshment. It is like "rivers of water in a dry place." When the soul is panting after God in his sanctuary, and saying within itself, "When shall I come and appear before God?" (Ps. xlii. 2,) God sometimes lets fall a word upon it, with such power and sweetness, as is seldom enjoyed even under ordinances themselves, or on this side of glory. Sometimes it is drawn up to heaven in prayer. At other times, it is influenced with love, by means of meditation, and cries out, "O how love I thy law; it is my study all the day." Besides, such a situation stirs up a Christian to a serious consideration of the way in which the Lord has led him, and to a close examination of his own motives and his own conduct, particularly in respect to the improvement of days that are past.

And withal, his spiritual appetite is whetted, and he is prepared to enjoy the ordinances more than before. He is humbled and chastened in his soul: he is more weaned from the world; his soul longs after the company of the saints, "the excellent ones of the earth, where his delights are all placed." Ps. xvi. 3 And in these things is the nourishment of a soul.

3d. When a professor, man or woman, is so placed, whether by the unavoidable circumstances of Providence, or by their own ill digested plans, it is still their duty to seek public ordinances. First, by prayer to Him who is the disposer of them, that He, in his own time, would either bring ordinances to them, or them to ordinances; and secondly, by petitioning ministers and presbyteries for supply of preaching. If these means were employed and persevered in, the solitary christian or family would, more frequently than they do, witness the loving-kindness of the Lord in answering his own promise. And if the Monitor comes to any so placed, I would urge upon them to use these two means forthwith. This is duty. Follow it, and leave the event to God. Let neither the improbability of such a thing as public ordinances in such a place, nor your own poverty deter you. Trust God, and He will bring it to pass. Delight thyself in God, and He will give thee the desire of thine heart. Ps. xxxvii. 4, 5.

(To be concluded.)

ART. II. *On the Controversy between the Protestants and Papists, respecting the Rule of Faith.*

You that receive the divinely inspired Scriptures as the only infallible rule of doctrine and life, and often, in your addresses to the Lord, cordially exclaim, "O, how I love thy law!" suffer me, if this brief communication meet your eyes, affectionately to lead you into some of those meditations which, to the pious mind, can scarcely fail to result from its reading of the present newspaper controversy between the Romanists and Protestants. Let us not regret, that such a public controversy exists. The Lord will overrule it. Who can tell the good that may result from it? The science of our holy religion is founded on sure principles that invite and challenge the strictest scrutiny; and the better those principles are understood, the more, in ordinary cases, we may reasonably expect, will religion, the subject of that science, be felt. Now that controversy brings those principles frequently into view; and consequently, a knowledge of them will extend, perhaps, in some degree, even among the Romanists; and meanwhile the abominations, &c. will be disclosed. And whereas opposition to your love of the scriptures, or to the beloved object itself, is much more like fuel on the "coals of fire," than like water to quench; when you witness the contempt which one side of the controversy pours upon the Bible, how sensibly your attachment to that precious book increases! How often your hearts reiterate, "O how love I thy law!" But to point out the many good effects that may be expected to flow from a discussion of questions concerning the infallible rule of your doctrine and life, your faith and practice, is not my design on the present occasion. Let me apprise you also, that I am not about to canvass the several abilities displayed on the respective sides of the controversy; nor about to advance, as if I were individually engaged in the dispute, a class of arguments formally in polemic array. No: I am going to propose for your meditation some few but vitally important matters, in an experimental and practical respect.

You have received the sacred Scriptures "not as the word of men, but as" they are "in truth, the word of God." Whence originated *your* belief that the Bible is his word? You know, from your own experience, that, in order to that belief in your minds, the Bible did certainly not derive its credibility and divine authority either from a pope, or a popish council, or the whole popish church: yet you believe, with tenfold more and with *other* assurance than the Romanists do, that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God." Nor do your firm belief and persuasion, that the Bible is God's word, rest on the authority of Luther, or Calvin, or the whole *Protestant* church. There is a pillar on which the corporation of a city have a certain law exposed to public notice; but, surely, that law does not derive its authority from the pillar. In such a respect may the church be figuratively called "the pillar and ground of the truth." Or, perhaps, the text in which the church is thus denominated, alludes to the cunningly devised fables engraved or inscribed on pillars and various other grounds in the temples of heathenism, and especially in the temple of the Ephesian great goddess Diana; and then the church is figuratively characterized as being the pillar and ground of the *truth* in contrast with those *cunningly devised fables*. No where do the sacred Scriptures tell us, that the church is the pillar and ground of believing the Bible to be the word of God. True, it was through the *instrumentality* of the church, believing, declaring, and proving all scripture to be given by inspiration of God; preserving the sacred oracles in their entireness and purity throughout every age; transmitting them from nation to nation, and from generation to generation; and every where publishing them for the conviction and conversion of sinners, and for the edification of saints, that you became convinced of the divine inspiration of the Bible; but the instrumentality of the church was not the *ground* of your believing that inspiration. The Bible cannot have derived its authority from the church: the true church derives her authority from the Bible. Many communities there are, clashing with each other, each styling itself *the church*. We cannot know, except from the Bible, which of them the *true* church is. From that inspired word of God, who "cannot lie," we know that the Romanists are not the true church. "Lo, they have rejected the word of the LORD; and what wisdom is in them?" Nay, more, horribly more; "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God!" Does not he blasphemously pretend that the authority of the Bible is grounded on his? The authority of the Bible depends on the Bible itself. The idea, that the sacred Scriptures derive their authority from the church, exhibits the *topsy-turviness* of a foundation resting on its own superstructure, and the absurdity of an effect producing its own cause. The church being "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone;" who, but Romanists, can believe that the foundation is built upon the church? Means, instruments, and especially the gospel ministry, are used and employed, merely as means and instruments, in building on that foundation. "Now we believe," said the Samaritans to the woman of Samaria, who had been the organ of communicating to them intelligence of the Messiah's advent, "not because of thy saying; for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world." The woman's saying, then, was not the ground of their believing, but merely the means by which a way was opened for the belief, that Jesus was the Messiah. John had borne "witness unto the truth," viz: had announced Jesus to be the Christ: "but I," said Jesus, "receive not testimony from man." The belief, that Jesus was the Messiah, did not rest on the testimony of John: the testimony of John served but as means

by which people were led into that belief grounded on infinitely higher authority. "I have greater witness," said Jesus, "than the testimony of John." So the divinity of the sacred Scriptures is believed by you, not because the church believes and declares it, but because of their own divine authority.* What must you think, then, of a church that arrogates to herself the credit, and impudently maintains the blasphemous falsehood, that the belief even of the divine inspiration of the Bible is founded on her authority! A falsehood so repugnant to your own personal experience of that fundamental article of faith, and so manifestly refuted by the Bible, as well as by your own experience, that, in regard to less important articles, you can have no confidence in her. You know, from your own personal experience, that you believe the divine inspiration of the Bible; and you know likewise, that you do not acknowledge the authority of that church. What an impudent falsehood, then, that her authority is the foundation of your believing the Bible to be the word of God!

I will now barely mention certain internal and external evidences, by some or all of which you became convinced of the divine inspiration of the Bible; and then briefly remind you of some things you have experienced of the power of that inspired word. The Scripture doctrines, harmony, style, and prophecies, together with the well attested and well known truth of ordinary, extraordinary, and miraculous events recorded in that wonderful book, and the history of the origin and transmission of the sacred Scriptures, furnish those internal and external evidences; that history including the fact, that, when popery was crowding itself into the church, (for the *true* church never existed in popery,) the sacred oracles committed to her, were faithfully defended, preserved and promulgated by her, even while she hanged her "harps upon the willows," and sighed and cried in the midst of spiritual Babylon, till the time of the great Reformation, when the true worshippers of God came out from among the worshippers of the beast. Those internal and external evidences are sufficient to produce a speculative belief, that the Bible is the word of God. But you, beloved in the Lord, since you have experienced the power of that word, view those evidences in a light essentially different from that in which the merely speculative believer views them. In God's light do you "see light." "It is the Spirit that beareth witness, that (οτι) the Spirit (speaking in the word) is the truth." O how powerfully does the word, in the irresistible operations of the Holy Spirit, prove itself to be in your hearts! Your first great change, effected by the Holy Spirit with the word, was a passing "from death unto life." When you first heard Jesus call "his own sheep by name," omnipotently were you drawn "out of darkness into his marvellous light." And does he not continue to speak to you as never mere "man spake?" Your hearts "burn within" you, while Jesus, in the Bible, talks with you "by the way, and while he" opens to you "the Scriptures." He exclaims, "Mary;" and your hearts reply, "Rabboni." Behold, does he not "stand at the door, and knock?" You hear his voice. It is the voice of your Beloved, who is "God of gods, and Lord of lords; a great God, a mighty, and a terrible," at whom "the mountains quake, and the hills melt." "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth! for" not a pope, nor a popish council, nor the popish church, nor a Luther, nor a Calvin, but "the LORD hath spoken." "The voice of the LORD is powerful; the voice of the LORD is full of majesty." Is it possible, that there actually exists a scarlet-colored, seven-headed, and ten-horned "beast," so "full of names of blasphemy," as to pretend to clothe God's own word with authority?

* *Desine, cur videat nemo sine numine numen, Mirari, solem quis sine sole videt?*—i. e. Cease to wonder why no one sees God without God: who sees the sun without the sun?

The sacred Scriptures, as the rule of your doctrine and life, your faith and practice, must be a perfect, a complete, and an infallible rule; for otherwise they would not be God's word. "As many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God;" for "the law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple: the statutes of the LORD are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the LORD is pure, enlightening the eyes: the fear of the LORD is clean, enduring forever: the judgments of the LORD are true and righteous altogether." "These are written, THAT ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and THAT believing ye might have life through his name." "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable," (*ὡφέλιμος*, *utilis*, useful,) "for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; THAT the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Were the rule imperfect, incomplete, or fallible, it would not answer those ends. And besides, the same reason why there is an awful denunciation against him who adds aught to, or takes aught from what was revealed to Moses and to John, (Deut. vi. 2; Rev. xxii. 18, 19,) holds in regard to every other portion of the Bible. What have you to do, then, with any tradition of the Romanists? Your Lord says, "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." The text, (2 Thes. ii. 15,) "Hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle," refers not to a difference of substantial matters propounded in respectively different ways, but to the different ways of propounding the *same* substantial matters; for the apostle Paul, though declaring "all the counsel of God," yet said "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses" had said "should come." Acts xx. 27; xxvi. 22.

Here we may remark, that, if Paul, while declaring "all the counsel of God," still said "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses" had said "should come," then the Old Testament must be a perfect, a complete, and an infallible rule, as well as the Old and New Testaments together are. For instance, does not the Old Testament, where we read, "The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken," comprise all that the New Testament prescribes for the rule of your faith and conduct? The text, (Heb. xi. 40,) "That they," viz. Old Testament saints, "without us should not be made perfect," implies no imperfection in the Old Testament, but refers to the state of the church and of individual believers. The Old Testament was the gospel of promise: the New Testament is the gospel of fulfilment. Now the dispensation of the gospel of fulfilment is better than the dispensation of the gospel of promise. And the church under the Old Testament dispensation was treated as a child, to whom the mysteries of faith were propounded in shadows and similitudes, called *στοιχεῖα*, rudiments, elements; a name signifying such a mode of instruction as is adapted to children. "The heir," i. e. the church, "as long as he" was "a child," as the church was under the Old Testament dispensation, differed "nothing from a servant, though he" was "lord of all, but was under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the Father." But now, under the New Testament dispensation, we are treated as adults, put into possession of that "better thing which God hath provided for us." Now we must have and manifest a manliness correspondent to the sublime prophecies concerning the latter day. "In that day," according to one of those prophecies, "shall the LORD defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem: and he that is feeble among them at that day shall be as David; and the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the LORD before them." But, however different the two dispen-

sations, both prescribe the same perfect, complete and infallible rule, i. e. God's word. Whether the rule was committed to any writings before the books of Moses, I need not inquire. That the light in which it was exhibited through successive ages gradually increased, from the mother-promise of the seed of the woman, till the close of the Apocalypse, does not affect the perfection, the completeness, or the infallibility of the rule itself. We are not to suppose, that the rule was not perfect, complete, and infallible, in what is called the unwritten word, before the time of Moses; or that the Old Testament contains but a part of the rule, and that the New Testament supplies the remainder. Therefore when I say that the canon of the sacred Scripture is now complete, I mean that the books of the Old and the New Testaments contain all the divine revelations of that same one perfect, complete, and infallible rule. Nothing is lost, nothing is lacking, of what pertained to the canon. He who has given us the Bible, does also graciously preserve it pure and entire for us. The books referred to by certain titles in the Bible, but not found extant under those titles, either were introduced, under other titles, into the canon of the Scriptures, or were never a part of the canon. And enough is revealed: more may not be expected: nothing may be added. Persevere, then, in rejecting all human traditions and commandments taught for doctrines: for you have in the Old, and now also in the New Testament, a very "sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts."

But you are told, that the rule does not work well, inasmuch as it is the cause of numberless contradictory and violently clashing tenets even among Protestants themselves; and also inasmuch as the characters of Calvin and other eminent reformers, adopting that rule, labor under some very grievous imputations. Even Socinianism is ascribed to that rule. What a blasphemy! True, some profess to mean only *the common use* of the rule, and not the rule itself; and so the blasphemy may not seem quite so direct and gross. But can you believe, or do Romanists themselves believe, that Socinians follow that rule? or that God's own word, or its use, tends to any false doctrines or practices? Rather say, "Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar." "Wherewithal," O LORD, "shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to thy word." Whatever the neglect, rejection, misuse, abuse, or perversion of the word may do, the use of the word never tends to errors either doctrinal or practical. The errors are not in the word, but in the depraved understanding. "The statutes of the LORD are RIGHT—are a STRAIGHT" rule; though the race of man is "a perverse and crooked generation." But the crookedness of man does not crook the rule: the rule remains always the same. Man must conform to the rule: the rule will not conform to perverse man. Christianity is not to be rejected, because papists, professing it, worship images and other idols; and so that rule is not to be rejected, because many, though professing it, do actually not follow it. As well may the Jews class you with the gross idolaters of popery, because you profess to be christians, and the papists do so too; as the papists class you with Socinians, because you follow that rule, and professedly the Socinians do so too. But why multiply? In a word, why has God commanded and highly commended the common use of his word? "Search the Scriptures." The Bereans "were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily." And with respect to the grievous charges, whether true or slanderous, preferred against certain eminent reformers, if you should suppose, for the sake of argument, that those charges were not only tenfold more grievous, but also completely sub-

stantiated, your position would appear the firmer, that no man's word is to be substituted in the room of God's, for the rule of your doctrine and life: for, if even those eminent worthies were such deplorably fallible men, what confidence can you have in the *ipse, ipsa, or ipsum dixit* or word of a horribly depraved pope, popish church, or popish council! If those reformers were the rule of your doctrine and life, then, indeed, your rule would be accountable for all the doctrinal and practical errors of those reformers: if popery were the rule of your doctrine and life, then your rule would be accountable for all the blasphemies and horrible-ness of popery: but if God's word is the rule of your doctrine and life, then—*what?* Enough, that God "cannot lie."

Continue to "prove all things," then, doctrinal, experimental, and practical, by God's word, as the only perfect, complete, and infallible standard of your faith; and "hold fast that which is good." Alas! how much of a popish spirit is pervading Protestant churches! "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God." Remember, that the great maxim of your faith is, "To the law and the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." See how many means of man's own device there are, such as unseemly meetings and whisperings, fictitious narratives, overawing associations, proud boastings, unprincipled excitements, &c. used for the conversion of sinners, and eulogized as if superior to the means of God's appointment. Try those artful human means by the standard of your faith; and then say whether God can bless them, and still honor, as he certainly will, his own institutions. Read the pompous narratives and reports of *enormous* conversions and revivals produced by such "sleight and cunning craftiness of men"—men eulogizing, without a blush, their own work as *God-like*; and judge, from the standard of your faith, whether Papists may not boast, with propriety, that Protestants are fast returning to the principles of "holy mother." For yourselves, have your understandings, wills, propensities, conduct, words, religion, your very nature, conformed to the word of God. Far worse than useless is that faith, which flows from ignorance, error, and falsehood. O how many a one, bloated with an imagination of his extraordinary piety, produced by the sleight and cunning craftiness of men, flatters himself, that he is wonderfully religious and spiritual, soaring far above that *dead* old fashioned letter, the Bible! whereas all his experience, and spirituality, and wonderful piety, are nothing but a fantastic image of a deceiving and self-deceived carnal mind. Beloved in the Lord, suffer me to repeat the great maxim, "To the law and to the testimony." The various other uses, the perspicuity, &c. of sacred Scripture, and the question, who is the judge of religious disputes, open a wide field, in which, peradventure, I may, in some future communication for the Religious Monitor, take a short walk with you.

V. D. M.

ART. III. Public, Social Covenanting.

RELIGIOUS ordinances owe their efficacy to a divine appointment. Being in themselves wholly inadequate to produce those effects which God accomplishes through their instrumentality, many have been, by this circumstance, led into fatal delusions. Some have regarded ordinances as *effectual* means of grace; and in this way have ascribed to external observances that work, which it is the peculiar province of the Holy Spirit to effect internally in the soul of man. Others, taking the opposite

extreme, have looked more to the *intention* of those engaging in the observance of ordinances, and to the manner of observing them, than to their nature. Hence the intention of the observer having been taken in the room of a divine appointment, they have, in some cases, varied the ordinances, and, in almost all, the manner of their observance; so that it is no uncommon thing to hear from the lips of a backsliding church, respecting this and the other ordinances, that it is not suited to our times. Having lost sight of the divine appointment, they have added to, taken from, and varied divine ordinances, according to human views of expediency and the supposed fitness of things. This is believed to be one of the secret springs of that flood of modern inventions, or new measures, which have deluged the Christian church, and almost blinded the eyes of men to a discovery of divine truth. But all such observances are vain and abominable in the sight of God. He will loathe them as he did the offerings of his ancient covenant people in the times of their apostacy. "He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood; he that burneth incense, as if he blessed an idol: yea, they have chosen *THEIR OWN WAY*, and their soul delighteth in their abominations." Isa. lxvi. 3.

Among divine ordinances **PUBLIC, SOCIAL COVENANTING** has always held a conspicuous place in reforming times, and has always been virulently opposed by apostatising professors. In its nature, it enters more or less into all religious duties, all scriptural ordinances, and all acceptable approaches to the Divine Majesty. But we speak now of formal, explicit, and direct covenanting, in which the covenanter, after due examination of his conscience in matters of true and false religion, and a humble confession of his sins and weakness, takes hold of God's covenant by faith; avouches the Lord to be his God, in opposition to all false Gods, and all idolatrous esteem of the creatures; and in the strength of promised grace, **PROMISES** and **SWEARS** with uplifted hand, that he will hold fast his name and his cause, unfeignedly endeavoring to walk in his ways, to keep his commandments, and to hearken to his voice, in opposition to all divisive courses, to all latitudinarian schemes, and to all prevailing errors. This kind of covenanting has the divine warrant,* and has, in a peculiar manner, distinguished the true Israel of God, in reforming times, both under the Old and the New Testament dispensations. We find the Israelites neglecting and despising this duty till God afflicted them with severe judgments; but when they were led to a discovery of their sinfulness and apostacy from God, we find them renewing their solemn covenant obligations. Neh. xi. 38; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 31. Then they **SWARE**, "the Lord liveth in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness." "And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels," was the gracious reply. Then they had peace in all their borders. In like manner, in New Testament times, when the first dawnings of the Reformation began to break in upon the long night of popery, we find this duty revived in a wonderful manner. It was repeatedly engaged in by all ranks of men in England, Ireland, and Scotland, from the year 1580, down to near the time of the Secession. And it is now *one hundred years* since the Secession church took its rise, in consequence of various abuses and corruptions in the church of Scotland, and *ninety years* since she engaged in this so-

* It is not the design of this paper to prove the divine warrant for covenanting; this has been done satisfactorily by many of the Lord's servants, who being dead yet speak; but we deem this a suitable occasion to call the attention of the reader to a Catechism on this subject by the late Dr. Anderson, in which he will find it treated by the hand of a master and all difficulties cleared up. Its cost is only twelve and a half cents, and an edition has lately issued from the press. It is an invaluable summary of scripture doctrine on this point, and should be read by every professor of the Christian religion capable of reading the English language.

lemn work in her highest Judicatory, as a constituted Court of Christ's house; since which time, through the mercy of God, there has been a regular succession of covenanting in the Secession, down to the present day. In 1829, the Associate Synod renewed her covenant obligations at Pittsburgh; and in the following year, at Philadelphia, since which time, a goodly number of congregations have followed in the same work. With the *civil* part of the Solemn League and Covenant, the Associate Synod has nothing to do, judging it improper to connect civil and religious matters, while at the same time she approves of what was then done. The circumstances in which the church found herself placed at that time justified the step taken; and hence the Associate church acknowledges the descending obligation of the *ecclesiastical* part of that covenant; because the church of God is one and indivisible. She is the same now that she was when first constituted on earth, and she will continue to be the same, till the *angel standing upon the earth and the sea, shall swear by him that liveth forever and ever, that time shall be no longer.*

Although it is foreign to our present design to prove the divine warrant for this duty, yet it may not be unsuitable to answer some of the most common objections brought against its observance.

It is objected, then, that "covenanting under the Old Testament, was a ceremonial duty, and therefore is not warranted under the New." We reply, that this objection is invalid. 1. Because covenanting is a moral duty. To avouch the Lord to be our God is certainly a moral duty; otherwise, the duty of acknowledging God must have been confined to the Jewish nation, and must have ceased to be binding on any of the human race, when the ceremonial rites ceased to be observed; an absurdity no one will maintain. 2d. Because it is predicted that this duty shall be performed in New Testament times. "In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan, and swear to the Lord of hosts: one shall be called, the city of destruction. In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord. And it shall be for a sign and for a witness unto the Lord of hosts in the land of Egypt: for they shall cry unto the Lord because of the oppressors, and he shall send them a saviour, and a great one, and he shall deliver them. And the Lord shall be known to Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day, and shall do sacrifice and oblation; yea, they shall vow a vow unto the Lord, and perform it." Isa. xix. 21—18. "One shall say, I am the Lord's; and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel." Isa. xlv. 5. "They shall ask the way to Zion, with their faces thitherward, saying, Come, and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten." Jer. l. 5.

It is objected, that the moral law, being perfect, imposes the highest obligation, therefore, covenanting is unwarrantable, and cannot impose any additional obligation. We reply, that the moral law is indeed perfect, and that in covenanting, we attempt obedience to one of its requirements. And thus *voluntarily* yield our assent to those things which were previously binding on us. And further, the law binds us to yield a perfect obedience to whatever God reveals; but if we voluntarily swear to yield this obedience, then, by disobeying, we incur the additional guilt of perjury, and, in a more direct manner, violate the ninth commandment, than could otherwise be the case. Therefore, in covenanting, there is no addition made to the perfection of the moral law, but there is a superadded obligation on us to keep that law. This is illustrated in the affairs of men. Every subject of a well ordered government is bound to obey all its lawful requirements; but if he *swears allegiance* to the government,

he unquestionably adds to his former obligation of obedience. And if men swear allegiance to earthly potentates, how much more shall they not swear allegiance to the King of Zion, who "is the King of kings, and Lord of lords."

It is objected, that "posterity are not bound by the covenant engagements of their ancestors." To make this objection valid, one of two things must be proved; to wit: either that the church of God is not the same in all ages, or that the matter of the covenant engagements of their ancestors is not scriptural. Now this has not been done by any one of all the enemies of this duty; nor can it be done. And although it may be conceded, without any detriment to our argument, that mistakes may be connected with the manner of entering into a covenant, or that there may be an addition of extraneous matter; yet if the substance of the covenant be there the deed is valid; notwithstanding one of the parties may be ignorant, at the time, of the full extent of the obligation assumed. For although the Israelites entered into a rash covenant with the Gibeonites, yet the matter being *lawful*, the covenant was binding on them and on their posterity. Josh. ix. 14—19. And if a covenant among men, entered into under such circumstances, cannot be disannulled, much more cannot the covenant of God be set aside. So that any supposed difficulty some of the enemies of this work have thrown in the way, because our ancestors entered into the covenant of God under different circumstances from those in which we are placed, or because extraneous matters entered into their covenant, falls to the ground. The descending obligation of the covenant of our ancestors then rests on us, because the maker of the covenant, God himself, declares it to be everlasting; because they entered into it really and truly, and because we actually swore *IN THEM*; otherwise we are not members of the same body of Christ. Why, then, should this plain position be rejected, especially by such as acknowledge the right of infants to baptism. In baptism, do not the covenant obligations of the parents rest upon the children?

This subject addresses itself to Protestant churches in a language that cannot be misunderstood. They are the descendants of covenanting ancestors; and they have not only neglected the duty, but have thrown contempt upon it. Will not God be avenged on such a nation? Will he not bring a sword upon them, that shall avenge the quarrel of his covenant? Lev. xxvi. 25. For "the church, in her transaction with God, is considered by Him as a permanent body, unaffected by the lapse of time, or by the change of individuals. Therefore, many ages after, He thus addresses that church which had sworn to Him in the wilderness; *I remember thee, the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals: of old time, I have broken thy yoke, and burst thy bands, and thou saidst I will not transgress.* Jer. ii. 2—20. He considers her members as bound by this covenant, as really as if they had been the very persons with whom it was originally made, *I swear unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee, saith the Lord, and thou becamest mine.* Ezek. xvi. 8. We accordingly find, that the guilt of covenant breaking was charged on succeeding generations, even although they had not formally renewed their covenant; and that they were punished as covenant breakers. 2 Kings xviii. 11, 12; Judges ii. 20, 21.*

It is objected, that this work is not necessary, because we engage to the same covenant of duty in the observance of the Lord's Supper. To this we reply, that the observance of one duty can never excuse the neglect of another, even though the duties be similar in many respects, any more than refraining from the commission of murder can excuse for

* Secession Testimony, 1804, pp. 109, 110.

the violation of the Sabbath. For the same covenant is entered into in baptism, and this surely cannot excuse the neglect of the supper; but rather increases the obligation to observe it: so in like manner the observance of the Lord's supper increases the obligation to engage in the duty of covenanting.

This ordinance of God's appointment, like that of the Lord's supper, is not restricted to stated times and seasons; but is always seasonable, although, from its solemn nature and the duties connected with it, it should not be too frequently engaged in. The oath of allegiance to our King needs not, from its nature, be taken but once; yet every congregation should engage in it with sufficient frequency to give young members an opportunity of engaging; and on such occasions, it is sufficient, that those who have formerly engaged give assent to their former deed. But there are times and circumstances which call loudly upon the people of God to enter into His covenant in a formal, explicit manner, to wit: when the despisers of this duty are increasing in numbers and boldness; when error is disseminated with increasing zeal and success; when the spirit of persecution is arising and increasing in bitterness; when backsliders go farther and farther in apostacy, and refuse to be reclaimed; when divine truth has ceased to have any binding authority on the consciences of men: when the preaching of the gospel is, in a great measure, "like water spilled upon the ground which cannot be gathered;" when the doctrines of the grace of God are supplanted by the metaphysical speculations of men of corrupt minds, and human inventions substituted in the room of divine ordinances; when the few that make a public profession of religion know not what they profess, nor the obligations they assume; when the civil authorities enact laws contrary to the revealed will of God; and when the people welcome and cherish among them the persecuting church of Rome; and when we are in imminent danger of divine judgments. Surely, in such a time, we are called upon to return to the Lord with weeping and with supplication, and "join ourselves to the Lord in an everlasting covenant," that we may find protection and safety, "when he cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity." And we have a confluence of all these evils in our day, and in this nation. Who, with the Scriptures of truth in his hand, can contemplate such a state of things without trembling for the cause of reformation principles and the spiritual interests of his countrymen? And let it be remembered, that with this cause must go civil liberty and all that is essential to the great body of the people in temporal peace and prosperity. Gospel ordinances will be either removed entirely, or which is more probable, be converted into engines of oppression, to strip the poor, not merely of their little of this world's goods, but also of their hope of heaven and future blessedness, that prowling Jesuits may riot in luxury, debauchery and crime, by means of their traffic in the souls of men. This nation appears to be fast approaching that awful precipice from which the Jewish nation, distinguished by Jehovah more than all the other nations of the earth, plunged into the gulph of misery and despair; and to whom the long period of eighteen hundred years has brought no relief. They have alternately suffered the fires of the Beast, and the bowstring of the false prophet. They are still a "people scattered and peeled." They wander in pagan lands the most abject and miserable of human beings, subsisting by beggary and having no certain dwelling place. If such be their outward condition, who can tell the darkness and misery that reign in their souls? They are conscious of the anger of the Almighty, and yet they have no heart to return to him. Whence, then, all this misery? Every Christian knows the answer. God, speaking by the prophet Isaiah, (chap. lvi. 12—16,) and looking forward to

the time when the cup of their iniquity should become wholly filled, says, "Therefore will I number you to the sword, and ye shall bow down to the slaughter: because when I called, ye did not answer; when I spake, ye did not hear; but did evil before mine eyes, and did choose that wherein I delighted not. Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, *my* servants [*they* were nominally *his* servants like the inhabitants of our own land] shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty: behold, my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed: behold, my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name: that he who blesseth himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth: and he that SWEARETH in the earth, shall swear by the God of truth.

It is not supposed, that the same *kind* of judgments can ever come upon any other nation for contempt of God's authority, and abuse of privileges; but they may be equally disastrous to individuals. Yet we have no fears for the church of the living God. Her boundaries may be greatly reduced; but she cannot be destroyed. Many who have been brought into the visible kingdom of God, on earth, may be destroyed in a most signal manner, for their abuse of privileges; but God will bestow these upon others; and there shall still be a people who shall *bless themselves in the God of truth, and shall swear by the God of truth.*

These observations have already extended beyond any thing that was designed, and must come to a close. They were occasioned by recently witnessing this solemn work in the Associate congregation of South Argyle, Washington county, N. Y., under the pastoral inspection of the Rev. James P. Miller. On Thursday, 20th of June, 104 persons, 92 of whom were members of this congregation, entered into the solemn covenant of God, and 18 who had formerly engaged in this work gave assent to their former deed. Seven ministers were present, who took part in the work; and on the following Sabbath the sacrament of the supper was dispensed, and nearly four hundred received this seal of the covenant. Seldom have we witnessed a more solemn or interesting scene. It was a fertile spot in a barren desert, and demonstrated to the humble believer, that however low the church may be at times reduced, God will not leave himself without a witness. May we not hope, that this example will be extensively followed by other congregations in connection with us. The most happy fruits, with the blessing of God, might reasonably be expected to follow. For this ordinance is calculated to lead persons to a thorough examination and knowledge of their religious profession, without which their religion is of little value. It is calculated to strengthen confidence among brethren, and, where it has been impaired, to restore it. We are to be mutual helpers of one another; and how can we be helpers to our brethren better than to give the assurance, that we will stand by them, sympathise with them, and encourage them in all their struggles to maintain truth and holiness in the earth? It is a sifting ordinance; it leads directly to self-examination, and enables persons to discover whether they are prepared to surrender all and follow Christ, or whether they still cherish the lingering fear, that they shall one day forsake his service. It is a comforting ordinance; it brings the believer in a direct and formal manner under the dominion and powerful protection of the "King Eternal." The kingdoms of this world may dash one against another, and be broken as a potter's vessel; but he is a citizen of a kingdom that cannot be moved. The fires of persecution may be kindled, but he is undismayed. Death ceases to be terrible to him; for he is put in possession of all the benefits of Christ's purchase; "*he that hath the*

Son hath eternal life." It is a glorious ordinance, in which God condescends to pledge his glorious perfections for the salvation of the believer. And it is all of grace. In it God comes to us with his everlasting covenant; and the Lord Jesus comes to us as our surety, having fulfilled for us the condition which God has annexed to this covenant, so that the true-hearted covenantor, notwithstanding his overwhelming sense of sinfulness and weakness, may say with David, "He hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and sure," which "is all my salvation and all my desire." O Lord, "forget not the congregation of thy poor forever. Have respect unto thy COVENANT: for the dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty."

To conclude, we notice an error into which some of the friends of this duty have fallen, respecting the *extent* of the obligations assumed in covenanting with God. Some suppose that the covenantor does not engage to *perfect*, but *universal* obedience, and thus make a distinction where none ought to be made. God requires of every intelligent being in the universe perfect and perpetual obedience, be he saint or sinner, angel or devil; and his language is, "be ye holy, for I am holy;" and, says Christ, "be ye perfect even as your Father in Heaven is perfect." Now these requirements of the divine law lead the true covenantor out of himself wholly unto Christ as his only and great Law-fulfiller. It is the perfect obedience and strength of Christ, that the covenantor has respect to, and it is this God has respect to in accepting him in this service. The covenantor beholds Christ as his, in the gift and grant of God in the gospel, and in this ordinance takes hold of him by faith, and appropriates him as his own; and so God, looking upon the covenantor in Christ, and regarding him as one with Christ, beholds no iniquity in him. And in this way does the believer become perfect and holy in the eye of the law, though *all* his dross which he has, *in himself considered*, will not be taken away till death. "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh away; and every branch that beareth fruit he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing." John xv. 1, 2, 4, 5. Thus it is manifest, that the covenantor engages to *perfect* obedience, which he truly possesses, not indeed in himself, but in Christ his Head and Surety.

ART. IV. *Strictures on a Dissertation on the Second Psalm.*

WE have received a number of complaints respecting certain expressions found in the Dissertation which we published in the last Monitor. It may be proper to state that we had intended to have accompanied that paper with some remarks on the points complained of; but in our absence, it was conveyed to the printer, and before our return, was worked off. Our correspondent, in his "strictures," below, has so fully anticipated us in what we intended at present to say, that we choose to let him speak in our place, and the rather as he is not in connection with the Associate Church. Hence the author of the Dissertation (who is a respected minister of another ecclesiastical body, but favourably known to our community by his published works) will perceive that the complaints above alluded to are not confined to members of our denomination. Indeed some of those who have complained to us have taken it for granted, that the author was one of our own ministers, and were, accordingly, exceedingly grieved at what they

considered his unsoundness in the faith. One Brother thus writes us—"I have no knowledge of the writer, he may be some one of my best friends, but this could not change my views of his opinions," &c. The faulty expressions in the Dissertation must have arisen, we think, from inattention; and may we not hope that the author will correct them? We have seen his Dissertations on two other of the Psalms, with which we were exceedingly pleased. We regard a work of the kind which he has in contemplation to be needed, and provided it should not contradict the doctrines and principles espoused by the Associate church, he may confidently expect to meet with encouragement from that quarter. But we will not detain the reader any longer from the following **STRICTURES**.

MR. EDITOR—The last Number of the Monitor contains an "*Extract from a work soon to be published, which is to be entitled 'Helps to Christian Devotion, consisting of Dissertations on the Psalms.'*" I am about to offer a few remarks on that Extract. It is a dissertation on the second psalm. While I speak in commendation of the author's many excellent remarks in that dissertation, I must not forbear to express also my belief and regret, that, unless I mistake, he deviates from the truth on the fundamental doctrine of the Trinity. I indulge a hope, that, before the publication of the work, he will be rectified in regard to that all-important doctrine; and that, if such of his sentiments on that doctrine, as in my view appear to be erroneous to a very dangerous extent, and to be an error into which he seems to have slipped probably through more than ordinary carelessness, were exposed with the spirit of meekness, and barely pointed out to him, he would immediately renounce them.

The author says, "It appears, from the history of creation and providence," (but why not of redemption? for he immediately adds,) "as it is presented to us in the word of God, that the principal object, which God the Father had in view in all his works, in this world, and in all his works among the angels, was to honour his only begotten Son." To say that the "*principal*" object was to honour the Son, signifies, to my apprehension, what is absolutely impossible; viz. that the Son can be honoured exclusively of the other two persons in the Godhead. I can understand, "that all men should honour the Son, **EVEN AS** they honour the Father;" and thus also should honour the Father, **EVEN AS** they honour the Son; but how one of the persons can be honoured exclusively of the other two I can not conceive. If either of the persons were excluded from any honour whatever in any degree, the whole Godhead would be excluded from that honour in the same degree: for each of the persons possesses the whole Godhead, so that the whole Godhead would be excluded in the excluded person. "The **LORD**," says the Supreme Wisdom, "**POSSESSED ME** in the beginning of his way, before his works of old." "Believe me," says Jesus, "that I am **IN THE FATHER**, and the Father **IN ME**." "My name," says the Father, "is in him." "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself;" and surely that is independent divine life, it being from eternity. From everlasting to everlasting does God the Father communicate the whole divine essence to the Son; and from everlasting to everlasting does God the Father communicate, through the Son, who likewise communicates, though as the second person in order, the whole divine essence to the Holy Spirit; each person always retaining and possessing the whole divine essence without beginning, succession, or ending of duration. Consequently, "he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father;" and the Holy Spirit is not excluded, for "these three are one." But I will not enlarge here with express texts for proof; my present purpose being little more than to specify the author's error.

The great business of the sacred scriptures is, to exhibit the three-fold economy of the Triune God, one in essence, and three in persons. From

the manner of God's existence arises a distinctive order of the persons, and of their operations; the operations and works being according to the manner of existence, and the order of the persons; and the persons being first the Father, second the Word or Son, and third the Holy Ghost. (1 John v. 7.) The manner and order appear most clearly in the three-fold economy of the persons in the execution of the covenant of grace, where the three distinct persons act respectively as Judge, Surety, Sanctifier, &c. for, though all God's workings outwards, his transient works, technically called *opera ad extra*, are common, since his omniscience, omnipotence, every divine perfection, the whole divine essence, whence the works proceed, are common, to the three persons, there is a greater manifestation of one of the persons in a work specially ascribed to him, than of the other two persons in that work. But God's workings terminating inwards, technically called *opera ad intra*, are personal. Under the covenant of grace there are also several duties and sins very clearly distinguished in respect of the three distinct persons; as in the commands and exhortations, "Kiss the Son," "Quench not the Spirit," &c. But neither does the manner of the existence of God, nor the order of the persons and of their operations, nor the respective distinction of duties and sins, imply any inferiority of dignity on the part of either of the persons, as if the three persons were not to be equally honoured as the one true God, simply and perfectly but one, so perfectly simple, that an angel, though a pure spirit, can not be so simply but one. How then could God the Father's "*principal*" object have been to honour his only begotten Son. I am not aware that any of the orthodox did ever disapprove of the sentiment which Marck, in his System, (chap. v. sec. 5,) expresses in the words, "*Convenire personas . . . in idest seu æqualitate honoris*;" viz. the persons unite in identity or equality of dignity and honour.

After an unwarrantable attempt to honour the Son, the author of the dissertation seems to degrade him. The dissertation reads, "But there is the distinction of authority. The Father has authority over the Son, and the Spirit, for he sends them both into the world, as he sends the angels. He gives his command, and they obey; and the Holy Spirit obeys both the Father and the Son." Here, not by way of treating with levity the all-important subject before us, but by way of shewing how strangely some will err in respect of the subject, I remark, that I have known one who conceived, that the distinction was very similar to that between the respective authorities of a colonel, a major, and a captain. I do not suppose, however, that the author of the dissertation means any such similarity. The source of his error here seems to be, that he lost sight of "the covenant" of which he himself has been speaking. Neither of the persons in the Godhead is inferior to the other two in authority, or in any respect, except by the eternal "counsel of peace;" and even there the inferiority is not proper, but economical. By that eternal counsel, contract, covenant, or free voluntary compact between the three persons, the first person asserts, manifests, and vindicates the majesty and honour of the Godhead in general; prescribes a law for the second person as the Surety for the elect; demands perfect satisfaction of him as the surety; and rewards him as being not naturally, but voluntarily, a "servant," whose "reward for the travail of his soul" is with his God, and in whose hand "the pleasure of the Lord" is prospering. Thus the first person is "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ" as *Mediator*, God and man in one person, a *voluntary* servant; who, addressing the first person, says, "Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me; I DELIGHT to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart:" for, irrespectively of the Mediatorial office, the first person could not be the God of the second. What we have now said applies to all such scripture texts as

imply inferiority on the part of the second or of the third person: for, as the exalted Jesus has "received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost," the third person is not excluded from the covenant, but pertains to the promised reward. Irrespectively of that covenant compact, the words *begotten*, *sent*, &c. applied to the second and the third persons, do not imply various degrees of authority, but refer to the manner and order of existence. It is in the eternal nature of God, that the divine essence exists in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; the Father begetting the Son, the Son begotten by the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeding from both. It is no imperfection that some things ascribed to one of the persons, cannot be ascribed to another person in the Godhead; but to exist in three distinct persons, each person having his personal properties, is a perfection of the whole Godhead, and of each person.

The author of the dissertation says, "The Father, therefore, decreed from eternity, that the Son should always proceed from him, and be his representative; and the Sonship of Christ, in his divine nature was eternal as the decree was eternal." Here the author, I think, is inconsistent with himself. He has already told us, correctly too, that the decree mentioned in the second Psalm, is "the covenant," though perhaps he might rather have said certain covenant stipulations. Now here he makes the eternal Sonship dependent on that covenant or decree. But how could the Father and the Son enter mutually into a covenant, which, in the order of nature, if the author be correct, was prior to the Sonship? Though the eternal filiation is the Father's "daily-delight," indeed, still it does not depend on his decree, or good-pleasure, but flows from his nature. He is the *natural* Father of the Son, whose Sonship is not by a decree, but *by nature*. The ground of that filial relation is not an eternal decree, but an eternal *generation*. The Father, addressing the Son, says, "This day," i. e. in eternity, as the author admits, "have I **BEGOTTEN** thee." The word *begotten* there signifies the same relation, all imperfections excepted, as a father among mankind sustains to his natural son. True, among men, paternity and sonship imply priority and dependence; but imperfections do not exist in the Godhead. Nor do we find, among men, time or duration without succession; but we dare not suppose, therefore, that God's eternity consists of successive moments. "Adam begat a son in his own likeness." God the Father begets a Son who is "the brightness of the Father's glory, and the **EXPRESS** image of the Father's person." Not in a figurative, but in a most literal, a perfect, and a complete sense, then, all imperfections excepted, is the first person, the eternal natural "Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" as the eternal natural Son.

The dissertation contains yet one particular to be specially noticed; though there are more, but I omit to point them out, that do not meet my approbation. I do not agree with the author in some of his remarks concerning the human nature of Christ, and the filial relation of the regenerate. "The holy thing that was to be born of the virgin," and to "be called the Son of God," was not merely the human nature of Christ, but the person of the Mediator. Christ's human nature never existed separately from his divine, whether in his conception, birth, death, or sepulchre. Though his body and soul had separated, both remained united to his divine nature. It was the Prince of Life, who was crucified, dead, and buried. Ye "have killed the Prince of Life, whom God hath raised from the dead." But if, as the author admits, the second person is the eternal Son of God; and if, in an inferior sense, "the human nature of Jesus Christ," as the author expressly says, "is the Son of God;" then, as Nestorius maintained, there must be two sons, and thus two persons, as well as two natures, in the Mediator. The author,

in his inference from Rom. i. 4. says, "Jesus Christ, as to his human nature, is declared to be the Son of God with power;" but the proper inference is, I believe, that, as the Son actively, by his own power, arose from the dead, he was declared to be the Son according to his *divine* nature, viz: "according to the Spirit of holiness," his divine nature being sometimes called "the Spirit," Heb. ix. 14. 1 Tim. iii. 16, &c., and not according to his human nature. In respect of our filial relation to God, the author might have been explicit, if he had not made Christ's dependent on the decree. Our filial relation to God does depend on his decree, grace, good-pleasure: Christ's does not, &c. The psalms, and especially the eighty-ninth psalm in which there is even a contrast between David and Christ, contain many things not applicable to David. The covenant or decree mentioned in the second psalm, I have said, is not the ground of Christ's eternal Sonship: the Sonship was a ground of the covenant. As if our Lord had said, I am going to tell concerning the decree, institute, or ordinance; it having just now been mentioned, that I am set King upon the holy hill of Zion. The first thing to be noticed, before I exhibit particularly the nature of the covenant or decree, is, that, even as the LORD hath said unto me, I am the Son by eternal generation; my eternal Sonship being a prerequisite to my entering into the covenant; "for who is this that engaged his heart to approach unto me? saith the LORD."

I think I have exposed several real blemishes in the dissertation: but it contains also many excellent things, too good to be lost.

You that have read these few strictures, permit me to exhort you to be well established on the all-important doctrine of the Trinity. That doctrine is the foundation of the whole gospel. Let us be willingly subject to the three-fold economy of the triune God. Let us render to each of the persons respectively the praise, honour, and service pertaining to him agreeably to that economy: for thus we shall then ascribe equal and undivided honours to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Reverence the majesty of the Father: obey the Son as the King and Lord of glory: grieve not, resist not, quench not, vex not the Holy Spirit. Then shall "the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you."

V. D. M.

ART. V. *Sketch of the Life of Mr. John Craig, who flourished in the Reign of James VI. of Scotland, and commonly called that King's Minister; taken from the Christian Magazine.*

THE memory of the just is blessed. As you have very commendably inserted the memoirs of several godly men in your useful Miscellany, a few passages of the life and death of Mr. John Craig are extracted, chiefly from Archbishop Spottiswood's History of the Church of Scotland, for the entertainment of your numerous readers. The lives of good men, and especially of godly ministers, will always be read with avidity and relish by those who have a regard for virtue and godliness. They are useful in two respects, to rouse the indolent, and to encourage the diligent. The life of this good man is chiefly calculated to invigorate trust in imminent dangers. He lost his father in his early years, who was slain at the battle of Flodden. Providence, however, provided him with a liberal education at the University of St. Andrew's. When he had passed his degrees there, he went into England, and became tutor to the children of Lord Dacres, in which station he continued for two years. But war breaking out between Scotland and England, he returned to his native country. He then became a monk of the Dominican order. But, (though it does not appear that he then had distinct scriptural notions of the truth) he soon fell under the suspicion of what was called *heresy* in those days of ignorance and oppression, and was cast into prison. Being cleared of that imputation, and released from his imprisonment, he went back to England, flattering himself that, by the interest of his patron, Lord Dacres, he might obtain a place in the University of Cambridge. However, that failing, he went over to France, and thence to Rome. There he found much favour with some of the highest orders of the clergy.

even with one of the cardinals. By the recommendation of Cardinal Pole, he was received among the Dominicans in Bononia, now called Bologna. Being a man of good learning and great dexterity, he was honored with some of the highest employments belonging to his order. And had he been suffered to continue in the darkness of Popery, he might no doubt have obtained the most lucrative employments.

But even in the territories of Antichristian Babylon, sovereign mercy sought and found him. The Lord Christ, the great Shepherd of his sheep, will seek and find all his own, wherever they are, and whatever hazard of perpetually straying they may be exposed unto. (Ezek. xxxiv. 11, 12. John x. 16.) The manner of his conversion to the Protestant faith is exceedingly remarkable. By his employment, he had access to the libraries, particularly to that of the *Inquisition*; and even there he finds *Calvin's Institutions*; a book which was blessed for making a great light to arise in the church. But it might be there for being burnt. This blessed book opened Mr. Craig's eyes, and made the scales of ignorance fall off. The good news of a free justification, which he now read, he could not conceal within his own breast. Wishing others to become partakers with him of the same inestimable privilege, he opened his mind; but prudently, doing it to an old venerable man belonging to the monastery where he now was. His friend confirmed him in the judgment which he had formed of the truth; but at the same time cautioned him against making his mind known, because the times were perilous, as he soon found them to be. This caution would have been thought prudent by any of less zeal than our young convert. When the Lord opened Paul's eyes, *straightway he preached Christ*. And as it is common for people, when the light of gospel truth first breaks up in their minds, to be very warm, he declared himself more freely than worldly prudence would have dictated. This could not be tolerated in those days of clerical tyranny; so he was presently accused of heresy, and sent to Rome, where, after examination, he was imprisoned for nine months, and lay all that time in great misery. This was not all. Being brought before the judge of the *Inquisition*, and making a clear confession of his faith, he was condemned to be burnt the very next day.

But God had great work for him to do in Scotland. Behold! how wonderfully, therefore, Providence interposes in his behalf; "The wicked shall be a ransom for the righteous, and the transgressor for the upright." (Prov. xxi. 18.) That very night the Pope, Paul IV. dies. His holiness being hated by the populace, they pulled down his marble statue, dragged it through the streets of Rome for three days, and at last threw it into the Tyber. In the tumult all the prisons were broke open, and the prisoners set free, and among the rest Mr. Craig had his liberty.

It is easy to suppose, he would stay no longer in Rome than till he could escape out of it. But how shall he get out of it in safety? and whither shall he flee? He wished to go to Bononia, where he had some acquaintances, who, he hoped, might give him some relief. But how shall he be supported by the road? The Lord interposed in his behalf in both these respects most wonderfully, I may say miraculously. As he was passing along in the suburbs, he met a company of *banditti*, of whom he was no doubt dreadfully afraid. But behold! one of the company taking him aside, demanded if he had been at any time in Bononia? He answered that he had been some time there. "Do ye not, then, remember," said he, "that walking on a time in the fields with some young noblemen, there came unto you a poor maimed soldier, intreating some relief?" Mr. Craig replying that he did not well remember, "But I do," said he, "and I am the man to whom ye showed kindness at that time. Be not afraid of us, ye shall incur no danger." And so conveying him through the suburbs, and showing what was his safest course, he gave him as much money as might defray the expense of his journey to Bononia. It was very much that such a man recollected him; still more that he should shew such gratitude for what might perhaps be only some small matter: But it was the wonderful goodness of God, that he should meet Mr. Craig just in the time of his extreme need.

When he came to Bononia, his friends looked strange. So, fearing to be again entrapped, he slipped away secretly, taking his course to Milan. "By the way," adds the historian, "another accident (I would call it a merciful providence) befel him, which I should scarcely relate, so incredible it seemeth, if to many of good place he himself had not often repeated it, as a singular testimony of God's care of him, and this it was: When he had travelled some days, declining the high-ways out of fear, he came into a forest, a wild and desert place; and being wearied, lay down among some bushes on the side of a little brook to refresh himself. Lying there, pensive and full of thoughts, (for neither knew he in what part he was, nor had he any means to bear him out of the way,) a dog cometh fawning with a purse in his teeth, and lays it down before him. He, stricken with fear, riseth up, and construing the same to proceed from God's favourable providence toward him, followed his way till he came to a little village, where he met with some that were travelling to Vienna in Austria, and changing his intended course, went in their company thither."

When he was come to Vienna, as he professed himself to be of the Dominican order, he was brought to preach before the Emperor Maximilian II. The Emperor much pleased with his manner of preaching, would willingly have retained him in his service. But Pope Pius III. hearing of Mr. Craig's being at Vienna, required Maximilian, by his letters, to send him back to Rome, as one that was condemned for heresy. And the Emperor, not willing, or perhaps not daring, to fall out with the Pope, dismissed Mr. Craig, but gave him letters of *safe-conduct* to prosecute his journey. When he came to England, he was informed that the *Reformation* was begun in Scotland, so he returned to his native country, and having joined the Reformed Church, offered his service as a minister. But having been about twenty-four years out of the country, he had almost forgot his native tongue. For some time he preached in Latin to such as could understand him, in a chapel in the city of Edinburgh. But having in a short time, recovered the language of the country, he then officiated as a minister of the gospel, in different places, for about forty years. He was first settled as the Minister at Holyrood-house. The next year he was taken to Edinburgh, and served as colleague to the famous John Knox for nine years. Then, by the ordinance of the Assembly, he was translated to Montrose, where he continued two years. Next

90 *The Doctrine of Calvin respecting the Extent of the Atonement.*

he was removed to Aberdeen, and had the inspection of the churches of Marr and Buchan committed to him, as *superintendent*, according to the style of those days. In the year 1579, he was called to be minister, and I suppose domestic chaplain, to James VI. and afterwards was commonly called the King's minister. He continued in this station till worn down by the weight of years, he was obliged to retire from public service. He lived sometime in private, comforting himself with the remembrance of the mercies of God that he had tasted in his past life, and with the assured hopes of a glorious and blessed immortality in the world to come. He departed this life in peace, and without any pain, on the 12th of December, 1601, in the 88th year of his age. "Mark thou the perfect, and behold the upright; for the end of that man is peace." (Psal. xxxvii. 37.)

He appears to have been all along a man of peace. As Spottiswood (page 161) writes, "Whilst he lived he was held in great esteem, a great divine and an excellent preacher, of a grave behaviour, sincere, inclining to no faction; and, which increased his reputation, living honestly, without ostentation, or desire of vain glory." His first days were exceedingly trying, and his last equally peaceful; which was a great happiness and comfort.

Though he perhaps intermeddled less in public affairs, than any of his abilities and station in those boisterous times, he was the author of two very notable pieces. He composed a small, but excellent Catechism, which was commonly known by the name of *Craig's Catechism*, and is bound up in the *Collection of Confessions*. This Catechism was appointed by the General Assembly in the year 1592 to be used by ministers in examining people before the communion. And it appears to have continued in common use till it was superseded by the Westminster Assembly's Catechisms. In the year 1580, "certain dispensations sent from Rome, were intercepted, whereby the Catholics were permitted to promise, swear, subscribe, and do what else should be required of them, so as in mind they continued firm, and did use their diligence to advance in secret the Roman Faith. These dispensations being showed to the King, he caused his minister, Mr. John Craig, to form a short Confession of Faith, wherein all the corruptions of Rome, as well in doctrine as in outward rites, were particularly abjured, and a clause inserted, (because of these dispensations,) by which the subscribers did call God to witness, that in their minds and hearts they did fully agree to the said Confession, and did not feign or dissemble in any sort." This Confession was sworn and subscribed by the King and his household, with the whole Court, for an example to the whole kingdom, on the 8th of January, 1581,* according to the new account.† Such was the origin of this famous transaction, and the hand that Mr. Craig had in it.

SPICILEGUS.

ART. VI. *The Doctrine of Calvin respecting the Extent of the Atonement.*

MR. EDITOR,—It has been often asserted, that Calvin did not hold the doctrine of a limited atonement. This has not only been stated in periodical publications, but recorded in books, and in books professedly written respecting Calvin and his principles. If my memory does not very much deceive me, his American biographer has roundly asserted this; and, for my own part, I have never seen it contradicted. Having access to the most of his writings, I have frequently searched for something which would clearly indicate his opinion. He always speaks consistently with the doctrine of a limited atonement, but says little directly on the subject. The following extract, translated from his exposition of 1 John ii. 2, will, however, not only show that he held this doctrine, but explain the reason why he has said so little respecting it. T. B.

1 John ii. 2.—*And not for ours only.* The apostle adds this as an amplification, that believers might be certainly persuaded that the expiation made by Christ extends to all who embrace the gospel by faith. But here a question is raised, "How can it be said, that the sins of the whole world are expiated?" I pass by the raving of fanatics, who, under this pretext, admit all the reprobate, and so Satan himself, to salvation. Such a monstrous doctrine is unworthy of refutation. Those who wish to avoid this absurdity say, that Christ suffered sufficiently for the whole

* Spottiswood, p. 308, 309. Calderwood, p. 96.

† The people of Scotland in those days did not reckon the year to commence till the 25th of March. So the National Covenant, in the title prefixed to it, is said to have been subscribed at first by the King's Majesty and his household in the year 1580, thereafter by persons of all ranks in the year 1581. But supposing the year to begin on the 1st of January, it was subscribed by the King, &c. as above stated, and by the rest of the kingdom in the course of that year.

world, but effectually, for the elect only. This solution has prevailed generally in the schools. But though I confess, that what they say is true, I deny that it is applicable to this text; for the design of John was nothing else than to state this to be the common benefit of the whole church; and, therefore, under *all*, he does not comprehend the reprobate, but intends those who should believe, and who were also scattered through the different parts of the world. For then the grace of Christ is illustrated truly and properly when he is preached as the only salvation of the world.

ART. VII. *Religious Establishments—Intelligence from Scotland.*

MR. EDITOR: I am glad to see, that you have made arrangements for securing some religious intelligence occasionally from Scotland; and, in the meantime, as I have lately been favored with a few sketches of the state of things there, I will state a few particulars, which I have gathered from letters and pamphlets, which you may not consider unworthy of the attention of your readers.

"The present truth" that is contested there most keenly, is the connection of Church and State. It must be well known to all your readers, that the Secession church, whose glory has been that it is a *reforming* church, in her advances in truth, has long been preeminently enlightened on this subject. About the beginning of this century, the work of one of her ministers, Mr. Graham of Newcastle, on ecclesiastical establishments, changed, as it is allowed by the historians of the English dissenters, the system of warfare entirely between the established and dissenting bodies, obliging establishments to take the defensive ever afterwards; so powerful was his attack. By the progress of discussion, the principles of his work are now embraced by almost all classes of dissenters in Scotland.

Amidst the distresses of the nation and the necessity of looking out for political resources, the rich revenues of the established churches of England and Ireland have frequently been pointed to, as national property; which might be wisely and lawfully appropriated to lighten public burdens. The example of dissenters, who, contributing their share as other subjects of the State for the established church, have at the same time maintained their own pastors, have often been held out as an argument to show how little real religion wants the enjoyment of expensive endowments and extorted revenues. Representations of this sort have had so far an effect with government as to lead at this time to considerable changes in the church of Ireland, a proposal of discontinuing the support of the established clergy in some of the colonies, and some slight alterations in the church of England.

The secularity of the church of England and Ireland had long been known; but the church of Scotland was often attempted to be held out as the model of an establishment, one that "works well." But of late its true character has been drawn by some of its neighbors. Mr. Ballantyne, of the United Secession, who wrote, a few years ago, a book called a *Comparison of Established and Dissenting Churches*, in which he excellently applies the doctrines of Mr. Graham, says, "Let the truth be told of this establishment: the one-half of its ministers are mere schoolmasters put into the pulpit, men whose study was not to be great divines, but accomplished tutors; that after pleasing some patron in the educating of his family, they might receive a living in the church; and who now go forward every Sabbath to repeat the same formal prayers which they have learned by heart, and to read sermons which they never wrote."

The arrogance of their claims, too, in their demands for new churches, asking accommodation in their houses for all the population, without respect to the numbers of dissenters in a country where the majority are such, has done much to bring their sect into disfavor. The support of this church has long been felt a heavy burden, especially in the large cities. In Edinburgh, £14,000 sterling has been collected annually, by a tax of 6 per cent. upon all rents within the Royal Burgh. A few individuals, two years ago, began to let their goods be taken, rather than pay such a tax against their conscience; but of late, the number has greatly increased, and the church of Scotland is now forced, with worse success than the church of Ireland at this time, to resort to the same odious means of raising her revenue. Store-keepers' goods and householders' furniture are often taken and exposed for public sale, where no bidders can be found, when the public are acquainted with the cause of the distraint.

In the meantime the Tower Council, the patrons of most of this city's churches, who used to select evangelical preachers, as often as they could, to fill vacancies, and encourage attendance for the profit of the seat rents, (which at one time was so abundant as to afford a surplus for civic purposes, such as paving the street,) have been petitioned by the starving clergy, as this last year their income has only been £300, instead of £600, or £700, as it used to be. This body, however, is not able to afford relief to their petitioners, as they have been obliged to declare the city bankrupt, while the Lord Provost, in assigning the causes of the failure, states some of the chief to be the building and ornamenting of established churches.

My most enlightened correspondents do not consider the nation as yet ready to throw off the yoke of an establishment, but they are determined to agitate the question, and spread what light they can upon the subject. Many pamphlets have been written, and some of the most eminent of the dissenters have come forward as the public advocates of their cause. As yet no name of note in the establishment has been engaged openly on that side; but some poor licentiate has been forced forward into the brunt of the battle; and, in a case or two, the consciousness of defeat has been soothed by the consolation of an early appointment to some vacant charge among the good livings of the church.

To prevent the calamity which some foresee, a few of the leading men are now striving in the petitioning for the abolition of patronage. The contest rages. Each party, instead of being led by a blind charity, as of late, in lending their aid to some united effort for the accomplishment of some mighty distant good, now seems determined to secure its own work under its own inspection, and go to the field under its own standard. Hence the spirit of party seems to predominate more at this time than for many years; and some of the great voluntary establishments, as the Scottish Missionary Society, are breaking up, which is nothing to be regretted, considering the wasteful manner in which they were managed, they often being but a shabby appendix to that system of patronage which is the curse of many of the institutions besides the established religion of that country.

"Voluntary church associations" are now forming throughout all the country. They are joined by most classes of dissenters, and by many private members of the established church. Their intention is to give the public information, by their speeches and writings, and show, that religion may prosper without its ministers being stipendiaries of the state. Meetings have been held in most of the large cities in Scotland; and, at this time, I shall conclude by giving an extract from a Report of the Speeches at a very numerous meeting held some time ago in Edinburgh.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIETY.

"That a compulsory support of religious institutions is inconsistent with the nature of religion, the spirit of the gospel, the express appointments of Jesus Christ, and the civil rights of man; that in every case, where the individual disapproves of the system supported, or of the principles of its support, it is an unwarrantable attack on the right of property, and a direct invasion of the rights of conscience: that it keeps in a state of unnatural separation those who ought to be united, and in a state of unnatural union those who ought to be separate: that its tendency, as exhibited in its effects, is to secularize religion, promote hypocrisy, perpetuate error, produce infidelity, destroy the unity and purity of the church, and disturb the peace and order of civil society: that, by its direct and indirect influence, it is among the principal causes of the low state of Christianity in those countries where it is professed, and of the slowness of its progress throughout the world; and, that while thus unreasonable, impolitic, unjust, and mischievous, it has not even the plea of necessity—Christianity having within itself, in the native influence of its doctrines on the minds of those who believe them, every thing which is requisite for its efficient support and indefinite extension." S.

ART. VIII. *The Compromise.*

ON the 6th of June, 1832, agreeably to the decision of the General Assembly, the second Presbytery was organized. When the Synod of Philadelphia met in the following October, they refused to acknowledge the existence of a Presbytery, which had been formed in violation of the Constitution; and it was encouraging to those among them who stood up for their rights, to find that two other respectable Synods had determined to present memorials to the next Assembly, requesting the reversion of the improper act of the last. These were the Synods of Pittsburgh and Cincinnati. The Synod of Philadelphia determined to unite with these Synods, in a remonstrance to the next Assembly, on the same subject; some extracts from which our readers have already seen, in Mr. McCalla's Letter, copied in the Standard two weeks ago. The remonstrances of three Synods, embracing 21 Presbyteries, and about 360 ministers, of whom we may venture to say, *three hundred* regarded the act of the Assembly, against which the remonstrances were drawn up, as unconstitutional, should have had some weight with the Assembly.*

On the 21st of last May, the complaints of a very small minority of Synod, (*three persons*,) and of the second Presbytery of Philadelphia, against the Synod of Philadelphia, for refusing to acknowledge the said Presbytery, were reported to the General Assembly by their judicial committee. These complaints, instead of being heard, and the Synod furnished with an opportunity of defending themselves, were committed to a select committee, who were to "endeavor to effect a compromise, if practicable, between the parties concerned." It is evident from these words of their resolution, that the Assembly did not regard the question, thus brought before them, as one which involved an important constitutional principle, but merely as a *personal* disagreement among the members of a Synod, which might be settled by *accommodation*. For, certainly, if they had looked at the matter as it really stood, they would have seen that they were instructing their committee to obtain, or to surrender, by compromise, what the constitution has already decided,—the specific right of Synods to divide and erect Presbyteries. It was not the business of Assembly to seek a compromise in such circumstances; but

* On looking over the minutes of last Assembly relative to the second Presbytery, we see no mention of the memorial from the Synod of Pittsburgh, which their communication to the Synod of Philadelphia, last October, had led the latter Synod to expect. We set down its non-appearance among the many other *inexplicables*, which are rife in these days. The deduction of the Synod of Pittsburgh, reduces the numbers given above, to 13 Presbyteries, and 237 ministers—probably 180 approving of the remonstrances against the act of the Assembly.

to set their face to the business like men, and to rectify at once, and with the spirit of genuine Presbyterians, what had been done amiss. But peace—peace upon any terms—appears to have been more precious in the eyes of the majority of the Assembly, than a strict adherence to the constitution.

The select committee sent for the second Presbytery, and asked on what terms they would withdraw their complaint. The Presbytery, which, as if in anticipation of this very movement, had adjourned at its last meeting to convene at the call of the Moderator, answered in writing, that “they would withdraw all complaint, on condition that the integrity of their Presbytery should not be violated by this Assembly, and that the consideration of all complaints, petitions, remonstrances, references, and other papers from Synods, Presbyteries, and individuals, should be indefinitely postponed, without debate, in the Assembly.” The select committee, in undertaking to prosecute their negotiations, on such terms, must have forgotten that it was not in their power, nor in the power of the General Assembly itself, to *compromise* away the right of the Synod of Cincinnati, who certainly were not among “the parties concerned,” between which the compromise was to be effected. That Synod ought to have been heard remonstrating against the anti-Presbyterian principle acted upon, in the Assembly of ’32; and some of the members of that Synod firmly pressed their right, for a time, before the Assembly; but peace—peace at any price—*peace* was rung in their ears, and arrayed against their arguments, until they were obliged to yield, lest they should be reckoned the enemies of what no doubt appeared to them, at the moment, *legitimate* peace;—an imputation from which the pious mind shrinks with horror.

The select committee next had an interview with 31 of the members of the Synod of Philadelphia, including, we presume, a committee of six, appointed by the Synod to defend them in the case of the 2d Presbytery. According to the tenor of the terms which the select committee had brought with them from the Presbytery, they ought to have summoned around them as many members of the Synod of Cincinnati also, as they could find, in order to ascertain whether *they* would be willing to give up the right of their Synod to be heard on the constitutional question, by the Assembly. It was certainly a curious oversight. Deducting the Synodical committee from the members of the Philadelphia Synod, there were 25 who either acceded to the overtures of the select committee, or were silent. The committee of Synod replied in the terms of the following document:

“The Committee appointed by the Synod to advocate their cause, agree in maintaining the following principles and measures:

“1. That the Synod, and not the Assembly, is the constitutional authority for erecting Presbyteries.

“2. They believe that the Synod itself has no right to form a Presbytery by elective affinity.

“3. That neither this Committee, nor the Synod, nor the Assembly, has a right to establish a new principle, or a new Presbytery not acknowledged by the constitution.

“4. This is the ground upon which the Synod appointed this Committee: and the Committee do not see their way clear to forsake it, either as individuals, or representatives of the Synod.

“5. The Committee feel their responsibility to God and the Synod, and they sincerely desire to do any thing and every thing for peace, which can be done consistently with principle. But they are obliged to maintain a good conscience, and they do it in sincere and tender affection towards those who may differ from them.

“Signed by order of the Committee,

“W. L. M'CALLA, Chairman.”

From this document it appears, that the Synod, as represented by its own committee, did not accede to the compromise; and that the few who did assent, could only do it in their individual capacity, forming, at

the same time, a very small fraction of "the parties concerned" in the matter which was to be effected by the select committee. Still, the Committee did what was "practicable," according to their instructions, with the exception of the oversight already noticed.

But the greatest oversight of all, committed both by the Assembly and their committee, was their not seeing that the principle involved in the compromise was an affair in which the whole Presbyterian church was a "party concerned;" and it should either have been settled according to the constitution, or postponed until it should be ascertained whether or not the Presbyteries were disposed to transfer the right of Synods to the General Assembly, or make it the common right of both, to divide and erect Presbyteries.

The Select Committee reported to the General Assembly what they had done, together with a resolution granting every thing which the Second Presbytery had demanded. Having thus evaded a question which they should have settled; the New School party being rejoiced at an issue which augured so favorably to their cause; the moderate men good naturedly supposing that they had now achieved lasting peace for the church; and the Old School-men being puzzled, amidst the excited sympathies of the moment, to know whether things were going right or wrong; it is not surprising, all things considered, that there should have been a short season of joy and thanksgiving. Misrepresented as the Old School party have been, as possessing a contentious and uncompromising spirit, they have in reality, feeling and affectionate souls; as they who have thought them deficient in sensibility and brotherly love, would most assuredly experience, if they would only return to the good, old fashioned, gospel path, in which our forefathers walked, to the glory of their great Redeemer.

By this compromise, the General Assembly sanctioned the following principles. 1. That Presbyteries may be divided without any regard to geographical limits, upon the principle of elective affinity, or personal preference. Consequently, every Presbytery which is at all disturbed by new doctrines, or new measures, may properly ask a division on that principle; and so may Synods; and so may the Assembly itself. 2. That the power of dividing and creating Presbyteries does not belong specifically and solely to Synods, but to the General Assembly also. 3. That accommodation is lawful in religious matters, even in those which are regulated and defined by the laws of the church. And consequently, 4. That the power of the General Assembly is paramount to the constitution of the church. We might legitimately draw additional inferences; but let these suffice. They are sufficiently characteristic of a decision, in which none but the enemies of the Presbyterian church should rejoice.—*Cincinnati Standard*.

CORRECTION.—We cheerfully give place to the following note, and beg leave to say to the intelligent and respected Session of Cambridge, that our mortification is as great as theirs can be, that the note to which they allude should have appeared in the Monitor. Had the "reports" which they speak of, as "*widely in circulation*," reached our ears, it would have prevented its appearance. It was not known, at that time, that the allusion in the note was to any congregation in connection with the Associate Church. Great caution should be exercised by correspondents in their statements of matters of fact; and, in general, we have no cause for complaint on this ground; but in the present instance, if the

allusion was made, as is supposed by the Session of Cambridge, and others, the statement had been better omitted, even though well authenticated. But while thus freely expressing our views of the note in question, justice requires us to say, from a long and tried acquaintance with our esteemed correspondent, who has fallen into the error in this instance, we have the fullest confidence, that it was altogether an inadvertency in him, and that no one regrets the appearance of that note in the Religious Monitor, more than himself.

CAMBRIDGE, June 18th, 1833.

To the Editor of the Religious Monitor.

SIR: The undersigned, members of the Session of the Associate Congregation, of Cambridge, are aware that some suppose the note in the last number of the Religious Monitor, (stating that the congregation of a certain Rev. Dr. in the state of New York was surprised to find in every pew of the meeting-house a copy of the Constitution of another ecclesiastical body,) refers to this congregation. This, together with reports widely in circulation, that such did take place here, makes us believe that it is our duty to undeceive the readers of the Monitor. We can assure them, that no such thing did take place, to our knowledge; nor do we know of any thing that could give rise to such a report, unless it be that at one of our monthly meetings a copy of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church was brought in by one of the members of Session, for a use, we believe, to be perfectly harmless, and was forgotten. We would, for the sake of truth, request the insertion of this communication in the next number, and would also add, that we hope it will be a caution to the writer of the note, to ascertain the truth of such reports before he publishes them.

John McClellan, John Ashton, William McGeoch, Edward Cook, Edward Small, John Dobbin, George Lourie, John Shiland, John Robertson, James Lourie.

ART. IX. *Ecclesiastical Record.*

At the meeting of the Associate Presbytery of Philadelphia, July 3d, the Rev. Archibald Whyte, jr. offered the resignation of his charge of the Associate congregation of Baltimore, which was accepted. A call to him from the united congregations of Steel Creek and Bethany, N. C. the late charge of the Rev. Abraham Anderson, was at the same time presented and accepted. By this means the Presbytery of the Carolinas has been revived, having been previously reduced to one minister. The aforesaid congregations not having a Presbytery of their own, were obliged to have their call sustained and presented through the medium of another Presbytery. May the Lord turn again their captivity as the streams in the south.

The call from the Associate congregation of Henderson, Warren county, Illinois, was presented to the Rev. James Bruce, on the 9th of May, by a committee of Miami Presbytery, and accepted. The installation took place on the 11th of May, Rev. Mr. Ingles having preached from Ezek. iii. 17.

Mr. Alexander Boyd was ordained to the office of the holy ministry, at New Castle, on Wednesday the 5th inst., by the Associate Presbytery of Ohio, and installed pastor of the Associate congregations of New Castle, Wilmington, and Mount Prospect.

On Wednesday, 3d July, Mr. James Strang, preacher, was ordained to the office of the holy ministry and to the pastoral inspection of the Associate Presbyterian Congregation assembling in Galt, Dumfries, Upper Canada, by the Associate Presbytery of Albany, N. Y. The Rev. John Russel, Stamford, U. C. presided in the ordination. He preached from Ezekiel, chap. ii. from the middle of the 4th verse with the 5th. He likewise addressed, as is usual, the pastor, after ordination. He was succeeded by the Rev. Thomas Ferrier, who addressed the congregation, and afterwards preached from 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16. The services of the day were performed in the presence of a large and devout auditory. To the greater number present, it had rarely happened to be present at the separation of one to the holy ministry; many had never seen such a sight. May the day be remarkable in the felicitous records of the church, and of the pastor; and may similar days soon be enjoyed by the destitute congregations of the Secession Church.

Mr. Russel and Mr. Ferrier were dispensing the sacrament of the Supper, at Esquising, on the Sabbath previous to the ordination. The congregation there has received considerable increase; and being well knit, animated with a generous and liberal spirit, and zealous, there is good hope of a place of worship very soon, and that according to the days wherein they have been afflicted, and the years wherein they have seen evil, they shall be made glad. Mr. Ferrier, who is at present laboring as an itinerant in the Province, went off immediately after the ordination, with two elders from the church in the English Settlement, London District, who had come to witness the solemnity. After spending some time in London, Mr. F. intends proceeding to Harwich.

There is yet much land to be possessed. The honor which the Associate Synod of N. America has gained in Upper Canada, is great encouragement to seek after some additional concessions of the moral wastes which are so extensive.—*Communicated.*